

*the Library of the Royal College of Surgeons  
the President, Vice Presidents & Council  
of the British Medical Association.*

MEDICINE.

ITS DIVISIONS, ITS REWARDS, AND ITS

REFORMS:

BEING THE

## ANNUAL ORATION

DELIVERED AT THE

BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

ON THE

8TH OF OCTOBER, 1840,

BY MARSHALL HALL, M.D. &c.

SECOND EDITION.

---

LONDON:

PRINTED BY J. MALLETT, WARDOUR STREET, SOHO.

At the Half-yearly General Meeting of the British Medical Association, held at Exeter Hall on the 30th March ult. it was, on the motion of WM. FARR, Esq. seconded by Dr. R. D. THOMSON, unanimously resolved—

“ That Dr. MARSHALL HALL, F.R.S. be appointed to deliver the Annual Oration at the ensuing Anniversary.”

C. H. ROGERS HARRISON,

HON. SEC.

Σωκρατης, ερωτηθεις τις αριστη πολις, εν ή, εφη, πλειστα αρετης αθλα.

“ Nec domus, nec Respublica stare potest, si in ea recte factis præmia non extent.”

## ANNUAL ORATION.

---

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN,

IT is with unfeigned reluctance that I have undertaken to deliver the Oration on Medical Reform, on this the fourth Anniversary of the British Medical Association. Intently engaged in other pursuits, it is only occasionally, and indeed principally at the meetings of this Association, that my attention has been directed to the condition of the medical republic in these kingdoms. I have therefore felt myself inadequate to the task of depicting its diseases, and of suggesting the proper remedies.

But there is a plan which a person the least acquainted with the subject may adopt. He may relate what he considers to have been hardships in his own individual career; and if each of the members of this Association were to adopt this plan, a mass of evidence would be produced which might guide the future legislator in his projects of just medical institutions. This mode of proceeding would doubtless prove egotistical and personal; but I think the resultant good would more than counterbalance this attendant evil.

With what feelings, for example, must any man, endowed with candour and a keen sense of wrong and injustice, read, even at this distance of time, the admirable "Letter to Lord Kenyon," by the late distinguished Dr. Wells,—distinguished as the author of the "Essay on Dew," which has been thus characterized by the first philosopher of the present day:

"We have purposely selected this theory of dew, first developed by the late Dr. Wells, as one of the most beautiful

specimens we can call to mind of inductive experimental enquiry lying within a moderate compass. It is not possible, in so brief a space, to do it justice ; but we earnestly recommend his work (a short and very entertaining one) for perusal to the student of natural philosophy, as a model with which he will do well to become familiar\*."

I recommend the perusal of that "Letter" to all who are interested in the subject of Medical Reform,—that is, in the honor, purity, and justice of our medical institutions. Dr. Wells contended for his *right* to be examined by the Royal College of Physicians, and admitted to its Fellowship. How many of the names of those with whom he had this contest ever travelled beyond the soil of their often unmerited, but lucrative popularity, or are now remembered amongst us ? How have they faded before the bright and enduring fame of him whom they so unfeelingly, so pertinaciously opposed ! Dr. Wells observes—"Amongst the voters against a ballot, on the proposal of Dr. Pitcairn, was Dr. John Burges." Gentlemen, did you ever hear of this Dr. John Burges ? Did the fame of *his* name ever reach you ?—It stands a far better chance of passing to posterity in the works of his opponent, in no enviable manner. On this point, I must refer you to the "Letter" itself. See p. 320.

How well do *we* understand the feelings which dictated the following almost concluding paragraphs!—"I have now, my Lord, finished my journey through the dreary waste which I undertook to explore. In my progress, no spot of verdure has been found, upon which the wearied eye might repose."—"My labour has been inglorious ; but should it furnish your Lordship with a more accurate knowledge of the ground I have passed over, than that which you formerly possessed, I shall esteem it most amply repaid."—"That the conduct which I have described should have been exhibited by men, many, perhaps all, of whom discharge with propriety the duties of their private stations in society, is one of those facts, relative to the human character, which,

---

\* Discourse on the Study of Natural Philosophy, by J. F. W. Herschel, Esq. A. M.



however difficult to be explained, are still unquestionably true.—‘All men,’ said an author, whose wisdom and eloquence have produced a change in the state of human affairs scarcely inferior to any that has ever been effected by the arms of a conqueror,—‘all men,’ said Mr. Burke, ‘possessed of an uncontrolled discretionary power, leading to the aggrandizement and profit of their own body, have always abused it; and I see no particular sanctity in our own times, that is at all likely, by a miraculous operation, to overrule the course of nature.’ ”—“I retire at length, my Lord, from your presence, and at the same time relinquish my struggle with the College of Physicians. I consider myself now as a veteran in the contest, and therefore as entitled to repose\*.”

In his Memoir of himself, written several years afterwards, Dr. Wells observes—“About four years ago, Dr. Baillie asked me, in the name of the President of the Royal College of Physicians of London, if I had any desire to become a Fellow of it; to which I answered *that I had none!*”

No! Dr. Wells had contended for his *right* to enter the College; and he was not the person to accept as a *favour* that which *was* his *right*, at the hands of those who had unjustly opposed it. His was no sordid, selfish motive. His contest was for the general good.

The observations which I shall first make will also relate to the conduct of the College of Physicians. They may, doubtless, however, be generalized and extended, *mutatis mutandis*, to other corporate bodies of the same irresponsible constitution and character.

I may premise that my observations will be very brief: for they will be too obvious to the candid and unprejudiced mind, and too well known to the well-informed, to require to be insisted upon at great length.

You will all anticipate that the first subject which I must notice is that distinction which has so long subsisted between the Fellows and the Licentiates of the Royal College of Physicians; a distinction which I believe *all* of the latter class have *felt* to be inflictive, invidious, and unjust.

---

\* See Letter to Lord Kenyon, in Dr. Wells's Works, ed. 1818, p. 415—418, 421.

No doubt you agree with me, that the highest, the most responsible office to which *any* medical person can be called, is that in which the health, the life, of a fellow mortal,—the personal safety of individuals, the prosperity, the well-being, the peace, the joy, of families, are placed in his hands. Is there any circumstance under the high and wide canopy of Heaven, any circumstance amongst men, or before God, of a temporal nature, which can be compared in weight and importance to this? Then *can* you imagine greater injustice and immorality in a legislative body, than that *it should grant its licence* to undertake this highest of responsibilities, and *withhold* minor, infinitely minor, privileges, — privileges which relate, not to the good of the public, but their own individual interest? What do you think of the enormity,—I speak as before the Judge of the whole earth,—of committing the health, the lives, of men, to individuals to whom they refuse the privilege of entering the doors, the walls, of the College, of taking a book from the shelves of its library, or of examining the treasures of its museum?—the opportunity, in fact, of fitting themselves, *pro tanto*, for that very responsibility?

There are some other inconsistencies in connection with the conduct of the Fellows of the Royal College of Physicians, of no less extraordinary character. Thus, they drag you before them for examination; they wrest from you your money, when you can least spare it; they confer upon you, as I have said, the licence to undertake the highest, the noblest, the most responsible duty of a physician, or indeed of a man, in human affairs; and they then degrade you by refusing you the right of entrance into their Hall,—nay, offend you by *invitations*, which are at once tacit but explicit denials of your *right*, to be present at their Soirées and their Lectures! whilst they engross every hospital, every commission, every post of honor or profit, in their power. And how amused have I sometimes been in reading over the list of the celebrated names of those appointed to give these Lectures! How well can I imagine the astonishment of a learned foreigner on such an occasion,—of one, for example, acquainted with our literature,



and accustomed to judge of us by our known labours in the cause of our science!

They submit thus to place themselves in a situation big with the *suspicion* of selfishness and of injustice, if not of actual and obvious wrong, instead of raising themselves, by a conduct at once just and generous, above that suspicion, —above the very “appearance of evil.”

I will not, from the fear of being charged with egotism or vanity, be restrained from a reference to my own individual case; and I will not shrink from the invidious task of setting forth my own claims to any such honor as the Royal College of Physicians may be supposed capable of conferring.

For, Gentlemen, I am not of the number of those who laud certain of our brethren for having recently refused the Fellowship of the College. For—Why did they refuse it? Why did they not rather carry into the enemy’s camp the principles of justice and virtue, and of good and equal government? What would you think of a patriot who should refuse to enter and fight the people’s battles in the House of Commons, because that House was corrupt? And what, let me ask, have these same gentlemen done since for medical reform? Have they enlisted themselves amongst your reform ranks? Have they seconded your efforts in the cause of reform by attending your meetings? No! no! Their names do not appear there! Their voices are not heard amongst us!

But, most of all, I pity some recently made Fellows, who, having long winced, nay writhed, under the infliction of being looked down upon as Licentiates, now, in their new dignity, affect to despise even the pure and just, and therefore laudable, efforts of this Association, and aid and abet in the continuance of the very injustice of which they formerly complained so bitterly!

But to return to my own case. What do you deem the true and legitimate title to rank and favour in our profession? Is it the boy’s empty doctorate? Are not, rather, lengthened and successful labours in the cause of our noble art and science? Then let me ask—who, of the Fellows, has this

title more than myself? Who has laboured more assiduously, more perseveringly, more successfully?

But if a high morality be the requisite for entering into the Fellowship, let me freely assert that there is not in this world a motive which could induce me deliberately to deviate, in word or deed, from the strictest of all rules for morality—those of Christ Himself. I think I may appeal to you, Sir, who have known me during so many years, for the truth of what I here aver. One of those laws is, as expressed in a classic oration, delivered in 1825, by the President of the College, in his character of the late Dr. Baillie :—“ *nihil alteri facere quod sibi faciendum nollet.*” Let this law be observed in very deed, and all these feuds will cease at once and for ever—“ a consummation devoutly to be wished.”

If I were offered the Fellowship,—an event the most improbable,—if from no other cause—from the very circumstance of the frank and honest expressions contained in this very Address,—I certainly would *not* refuse it; but I would raise my feeble voice within the College, and plead there the just cause which I advocate amongst you this day—the cause of *equal rights and privileges to all* in our profession, high or low. I thank God, I am independent enough to be indifferent to *all* these things; but I have a keen sense of wrong and injustice; and I therefore feel indignant, whilst I feel indifferent.

Before I leave this subject, let me remind you, that the distinction made between the Fellows and the Licentiates is, in reality, a *religious* distinction. Why are the graduates of Edinburgh excluded from the Fellowship, whilst those of Dublin are admitted into it? The “*fons et origo*” of this distinction are this—the University of Dublin is episcopal, that of Edinburgh presbyterian; the graduates of the former are, *therefore*, admitted at Oxford and Cambridge “*ad eundem*,” and *therefore* to the Fellowship of the College of Physicians; the graduates of the latter, though probably episcopalian themselves, are not! Can anything be imagined more shocking, more iniquitous, more *immoral*, than this mingling of sacred things with profane, of religious with medi-



cal distinctions and privileges? Of religion it is a mockery. It is hypocrisy. It is the offering of bribes and temptations to act with insincerity. It is intolerance. How must a Christian indeed pity it! How sad is it, that a man's religion may not consist,—in this land of liberty, civil and religious,—without his sustaining loss,—*in his entering his closet, and, when he has shut his door, praying unto his Father in secret!*

Finally, does the sufferer, or the inflicter of wrong, most resemble the Christian? I appeal to you, Sir, who do not despise these things, and I trust I may appeal to all who hear me this day, in reference to this question.

But I turn from this, doubtless the principal object of my remarks, in order that I may briefly notice some other points. I constantly, in my own mind, view Medicine as divided into the *three* following branches:

1, *The Science*; 2, *The Art*; 3, *The Trade*.

I need not say that the highest of these is the *Science*. By and for his successful efforts in the cause of his science should every professional person be rewarded.

Your judges in this case must be supposed to be competent and just, for they are your brethren. It is true that envy and jealousy are frequently excited; pert boys, during their pupillage, and totally incompetent to the task, are encouraged to sit in the chair of the critic; the truth and the originality of your well-established discoveries may be disputed in turns;—some former writer may be pointed out as offering a “complete anticipation” of your views, who affords no anticipation of them whatever; and you may be taxed with plagiarism, when there was, in reality, nothing to steal. The folly, the iniquity, the falsehood of all this, may be pointed out, and yet there may be neither the inclination nor the virtue to confess and repair the wrong. Nevertheless, *time*, the great revealer of all things, at length establishes the truth, and your reward, though tardy and niggard, comes at last; first, perhaps, from the hands of foreigners, but eventually even at home. There is one remedy for this evil; it is the institution of the *Court of Honour* already contemplated by this Association\*.

---

\* See the Laws, &c. 2nd edit. 1839, ch. x.

The Royal Society is expressly established for the “improving natural knowledge ;” and it has in its hands many rewards, and especially a Royal Medal, given each third year, for the most important paper on *Physiology* presented to the Society during the interval—an invaluable reward if justly, the merest bauble if unjustly, bestowed. Unfortunately, this learned body offers no exception to the remarks of Mr. Burke, already quoted. The paper on Dew, the immortal paper on Vaccination, were rejected by it at first, and refused a place in its *Transactions*. I need not wonder that my own should under a malignant influence, share the same fate ; or that when I requested that some competent person might be deputed to witness my experiments, and report to the Council—and *when I offered to sacrifice the emoluments of my profession for five years*—in order that I might devote myself to my researches exclusively—a sacrifice, the magnitude of which, you, gentlemen, are best prepared to appreciate—my request and my offer were alike rejected !

The detailed, collateral history of *this* transaction, might not be useless to the Royal Society itself, in its future career, and to the cause of Science generally ; but especially to the fortunes of its humbler cultivators in our own profession. But I have neither the leisure nor the inclination, at this moment, for this painful task ; and this is not the proper occasion for prosecuting the subject further. I confidently leave the question in all its bearings to the judgment of the physiologists of other countries, and of other times, recalling to mind, as I do, the similar treatment, and the subsequent history, of the labours of Wells and of Jenner, to which I have just adverted, as well as those of many others. Every day adduces fresh proof, that the Royal Medal given next after June, 1833, the date of my first Memoir on the Nervous System, in right belonged to me, and that my second Memoir should have, at this time, a place in the *Philosophical Transactions*.—I conclude, in the words of Sir Humphry Davy, after Newton, the most distinguished President of that Society,—that “it is better to deserve honours and not to have them, than to have them and not deserve them.”

In regard to the *Art* or practice of medicine, those are, for the most part, our judges, who are confessedly, totally



incompetent to the task—our patients themselves. They may appreciate your attention and kindness—and these deserve their reward ; but they cannot appreciate your acquirements and skill. It is true, the good opinion of our brethren frequently and very justly leads to that of the public. But frequently, too, it happens, that boasting and bluster pass for genuine knowledge ; and many thus reap an undeserved reward. But here, again, *time* generally effects a just retribution ; and eventually talent and industry receive their due measure of recompense. Doubtless an *earlier* appreciation of the attainments of candidates for medical fame will be afforded by the “ *public* examinations, theoretical and practical,” proposed by this Association\*.

The *Trade* of medicine—although a native of this commercial nation can never be supposed to disparage legitimate trade—ranks lowest in the medical republic. The trade in medicine is not, however, without its value and its dignity. The purity of drugs, and the perfection of chemical preparations, are of the highest importance to the profession and to the public.

In their relation to mental habits, a similar distinction holds between the Science, the Art, and the Trade of medicine. The science exercises the higher faculties, and induces a higher tone of the mind ; the art offers many opportunities for the exercise of the most elevated judgment, and of the most exalted benevolence ; but the mere trade—the habit of buying and selling for mere profit—is incompatible with the dignity of our profession.

For these reasons, I think that a strict alliance should be cultivated between the art and the science of medicine ; whilst that art should be separated at once and for ever from its trade. Nobler modes of *remuneration* should be devised than those at present in use ; and the scale of education and of remuneration should be raised together.

I now proceed to add a few words on the *Rewards* of medicine ; these are—

---

\* See the “ Outlines of a Plan of Medical Reform,” § vii.



1, *Its Honours* ; 2, *Its Posts* ; 3, *Its Emoluments*.

It has always been my opinion, that every member of our profession should be the maker of his own fortune : talent and industry—which, combined, lead to attainments—are the only legitimate objects of reward. I would have the path to distinction a highway, open, and equally open, to *all*.

There must—and there will always—be grades in our profession, of a certain kind. One may *choose* to be engaged in consultation alone ; another may *prefer* general practice. Be it so. Let all be as free as the air we breathe. One may choose medicine ; another, surgery ; another, obstetrics ; a fourth, the profession of the oculist ; a fifth, that of the dentist. This division of labour does good. No one individual *can* do *all* things well ; but a person of moderate talent may *excel* in *one*. The profession and the public, in this, as they ought to do in every thing, equally reap the advantage.

But let the custom amongst medical practitioners of selling medicines, and even of sending medicines to their patients, cease for ever, except in rural districts, and with a license from the proper authorities. And, as I have said, let better and more honourable modes of remuneration be devised. The expression of this sentiment is not at variance with our sympathy with well-educated persons, whom *necessity* may formerly have driven to the trade in drugs, and whom we may see unjustly persecuted by a class of men who happen to be empowered by the iron rod of the law thus to afflict them ; as I humbly think was recently done, in a sister country.

There are other degradations to which the medical profession is exposed, not much less humiliating than this compulsory and odious mode of remuneration. If, for instance, you would obtain an Hospital, its portals are only open to those who, through sycophancy and hypocrisy, gain the interest of the little great. And if it be an Hospital of humbler grade, a parochial Infirmary, must you not condescend to “ canvass ” the butcher, the baker, &c. &c. And need I say what kind of candidate will generally be preferred ? Indeed, I believe the principal questions on such occasions are—whether you be a customer ! or of the same political party !

I do not think that better things can be said of the manner in which the Professorships, even of our pretended liberal College, are conferred. The affair of testimonials is an absolute mockery. Intrigue is predominant. Independence of principle and of conduct is certain to exclude. On a recent occasion, when I was a candidate for the chair of Medicine, I ascertained that the Council had been induced to receive an application *after* the period appointed and limited by themselves for such reception! *I instantly withdrew mine.* I did not think the transaction consistent with the honour of any party.—I waited and quietly watched for the result. That I judged and acted correctly, was proved by the fact, that that very application, so unduly presented and accepted, was the successful one! Indeed, the under-current had become *but too evident.* What folly to have written to MM. Flourens, Louis, Müller, &c. &c. &c. for certificates of *their* good opinion!

There is *one* remedy for *these* evils—and only one. It is a *public* CONCOURS. Appointments made by such a concours will be at once honorable to the individual, and beneficial to the public, assuring to the former a just reward of his talents and industry, and to the latter the ablest medical officer. How, in a very short period, would the face of things in this Metropolis be changed! And one would think that none but the idle and the ignorant could object to *this* wholesome reform; without which, every Act of Parliament for the protection and amelioration of our profession must be defective.

In reference to this subject of rewards, I may observe that I am perfectly ready to admit that the Oxford and Cambridge graduates have an advantage over those of Edinburgh or Dublin. It is afforded by greater classical attainments. It is a fair and a legitimate one. Let them be content with such. I say *such*—for they have many others. In connections and in interest they have others—and although these are not *quite* so legitimate, yet I do not see that they are, as their invidious distinctions are, unfair or unjust. The graduates of Edinburgh have, I think, the advantage, generally speaking, of an earlier and more practical knowledge of their



profession. Do away with invidious and iniquitous distinctions, and they also may and will be content.

I have another remark to make—I think that, as the Oxford and Cambridge graduate has more *literature*, the Edinburgh graduate has more *science*, generally speaking. Which is the more related to the art of the physician, I leave you, gentlemen, to determine.

One merit I must claim for the Edinburgh graduate. As he has generally more science than the Oxford or Cambridge graduate, so I think that medicine has made more progress in his hands. I would adduce the names of Prout and of Bright, amongst our contemporaries, as prominent examples. Both were my contemporaries at college, and I delight in doing them this act of justice. The time would fail me were I to attempt to repeat the names of all those who have done honor to my Alma Mater by their labours in our science. But, gentlemen, there is one more name which I *must* adduce on this occasion; it is the name of Grant, which this day adorns our list of Honorary Members: first in his science; an example at once of the most exalted talent and of the most exalted virtue, of singular devotion to his noble pursuits, and of a noble indifference to pecuniary advantage; whom to know, is to admire and revere; of whom I would say, as Brougham once said of Denman, that you might as well attempt to turn the Thames from its course, as Grant from the path of honor.

I may here remark, that the Surgeons have been active in the pursuit of the science of our profession. There are also many excellent names amongst the General Practitioners. I need scarcely mention that of Hey, that of Hodgson. But I would, in an especial manner, notice the recent labours of Mr. R. Ceely, of Aylesbury, a name destined henceforth to be associated with that highest of all names amongst Physicians and the friends of humanity—the name of Jenner! And remember, Gentlemen, that Jenner himself was a general practitioner. Follow the example of this wise and excellent man: pursue your laborious avocations, interposing between its anxious hours, moments of devotion to research, to experiment, to physiology, to pathology, led by the love of



truth, the love of a just and honourable fame : and you *will* then accomplish, in the only legitimate manner, one of your objects,—*the extinction of grades in our profession.*

Gentlemen, many motives have induced me to pursue the argument of this Oration in the manner I have done : in the first place, the view which I have taken is that with which I may be supposed to be best acquainted ; in the second, it is one which *is entirely omitted in your Outlines*, and must therefore be supposed to be least known to you. I have also another motive : the fact which I have last mentioned will prove to you how little of selfishness there has been in my relation to this Association. My attention has, in fact, been fixed upon the general good, and that of our profession, divested of *all* personal, all private interests. *Non sibi, sed toti*—should be the motto and the motive of all reformers.

I will finally draw your attention to a few

### *Principles of Medical Legislation.*

The object of all legislation for the Medical Profession should be to secure *the best medical advice and care for the sick public.*

This legislation should be for *the whole* profession, not for *the few* ; and for the *public*, not for the *profession only.*

With this view,

1. The scale of education should be high.
2. The examinations of candidates for license to practise should be public and practical.
3. The diplomas should be one and uniform over the whole British dominions.
4. All offices of *trust* should be conferred by the suffrages of the whole profession.
5. All offices requiring *skill* should be conferred by public Concours, held in London, Edinburgh, or Dublin.
6. To offices of trust or skill all in the profession should be equally eligible.
7. The whole profession should be united into one body or Faculty.
8. All the members of this Faculty should enjoy equal rights and privileges absolutely.

9. There should be no differences in the profession, except those which a member of it may make for himself by his talent and industry, his choice of a rank, as that of a consultant or of a general practitioner, that of a department, as of the physician, surgeon, accoucheur, oculist, dentist, &c.

10. The line of practice should be left to the choice of each individual; for this will naturally be controlled by the wants of the public.

11. Every effort should be made by the public, as well as by the profession itself, to raise the medical character. It is true, medical persons will derive the first benefit of such a change; but eventually the public will reap a benefit far more precious, in the augmented confidence they will feel, that, in sickness, the best medical aid is at hand. None suffer so much from a depressed state of the medical profession in a country, as the public in the hour of sickness and danger.

12. In legislating for the medical profession, it will be necessary to bear in mind, not the profession only, not the richer part of the public, but the poor and the destitute. None are so ready to give gratuitous services to the poor as the members of my own profession. Let them be left to the spontaneous impulse of their own heart, and the poor will never suffer for want of their best care. On the other hand, let them be protected from the hard measures which, judging from appearances, the Poor-law Commissioners are ready to deal out to them.

Gentlemen, I here terminate these very hasty and desultory observations, for such I confess they are. Let me now earnestly beg you to pursue your noble and generous designs, nor doubt of ultimate success. Be united—let self be sacrificed on the altar of the general good—professional and public—for these are indissoluble. Let a genuine impartiality henceforth actuate our noble profession. Do away with every invidious distinction, and let real merit, talent, industry, and successful research, receive their just reward, whoever the individual may be.

JUSTICE is represented as blindfold—not seeing the persons, and therefore impartial—weighing the deeds of men and holding up the scales to the gaze of the world—and setting forth the TRUTH for its admiration—its reward.

And now, Gentlemen, I think I may retire from all active participation in your affairs, with the consciousness of having done my duty. I shall, however, ever take a deep interest in your progress. Your cause is one of JUSTICE, of TRUTH, in the highest sense of those words, and must prevail. With many apologies for having detained you so long, and for having occupied you one moment about myself, I would remind you of the words of one whom we all admire:—"O magna vis veritatis, quæ contra hominum ingenia, calliditatem, solertiam, contraque omnium insidias, facilè se per seipsam defendat!"

FINIS.

---

MEDICAL WORKS BY DR. MARSHALL HALL.

*The Principles of DIAGNOSIS, and of the Theory and Practice of Medicine.*

*Commentaries on the Constitutional Diseases of Females.*

*Observations on the due Administration of Bloodletting, and on the Morbid and Curative Effects of Loss of Blood.*

*An Experimental Essay on the Circulation of the Blood.*

*Memoirs and Lectures on the Nervous System.*



IN THE PRESS.

I.

LECTURES on the NERVOUS SYSTEM and its DISEASES. 3rd ed. 8vo. By MARSHALL HALL, M.D. F.R.S. &c.

This volume will be entirely *practical*. It will treat of

I. The *Diseases* of the *Brain*, *Spinal Marrow*, and *Nerves*, in *Children*; viz. Hydrocephalus and the Hydrocephaloid Diseases; Convulsive and Paralytic Diseases; Chorea; &c.

II. The *Diseases* of the *Brain*, *Spinal Marrow*, and *Nerves*, in *Adult Age*; viz. Inflammation; Apoplexy; Paralysis; Mania; Epilepsy; Chorea; Painful, Spasmodic, and Paralytic Tic, and similar Topical Affections; &c.

III. The influence, on the *Nervous System*, of Gout; of Derangements of the Digestive Organs, of the Kidneys, &c.; of Chlorosis; of loss of blood; of emotion; of excesses; &c. &c.

IV. The *Prevention* and *Treatment* of Diseases of the Nervous System.

II.

MEMOIRS on the NERVOUS SYSTEM. 4to. Memoirs III, IV, and V. Memoirs I and II are already published.

These Memoirs treat of the *Anatomy*, *Physiology*, *Pathology*, and *Therapeutics* of the Nervous System.

---

“Many of these facts have been witnessed, and reasoned upon, by previous physiologists, previous observers; but to Dr. MARSHALL HALL belongs the credit of having fully shewn their connection with each other, of having first successfully generalized them, and of having given to this part of PHYSIOLOGY the form of a consistent doctrine; and to him belongs exclusively the merit of applying a knowledge of these phenomena to PATHOLOGY: and here, no less than in physiology, the application of the doctrine is of the highest interest and importance: indeed, as regards pathology, excepting the introduction of the STETHOSCOPE, which after all is perhaps not a fair subject of comparison, I can think of no single improvement which has taken place since I began the study of medicine, equal to this, or so likely to prove fruitful in important results.”

Professor SHARPEY, in his Lectures at University College.